

Amendment to the Drawings

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figure 2. Changes are shown on the Annotated Sheet, and a clean version is provided on the Replacement Sheet. These drawing sheets replace the original drawing sheets.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the first Office Action. Claims 12-14 and 16-28 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-11 and 15 were examined. Claims 1-11 and 15 stand rejected. Claims 1-4, 7-11, and 15 are amended. Claims 5 and 6 are canceled. No new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the currently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Request for Examiner Interview

Applicant believes that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance, as discussed in more detail below. If, however, the Examiner believes additional amendment is necessary in order to clarify the claim recitations, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the attorney listed below to discuss proposed amendments which will expedite a Notice of Allowance in this case.

Election/Restriction

Applicant hereby affirms the election of Group I, claims 1-11 and 15 made by Paul J. White during a telephone conversation with the Examiner on August 11, 2008.

Drawings

Applicant has amended the drawings consistent with the Examiner's recommendations.

Specification

Applicant has amended the specification consistent with the Examiner's recommendations. Applicant appreciates the Examiner noting these typographical errors.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended the claims consistent with the Examiner's recommendations. Applicant appreciates the Examiner noting these typographical errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

The Office Action rejected claims 2-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicant believes that the amendments address each of these rejections. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thoroughness.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(b) - Diaz

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 5, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over the reference "Preparing of biaxially cube textured Ag, Cu-Au and Cu-Au-Ag films on Cu substrates for HTS coated conductor applications" by Diaz, et al. ("Diaz"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to recite "A method of forming a gold layer having pure biaxial texturing on a nickel substrate." (emphasis added). Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., in the Figures. Diaz does not disclose at least these recitations. Claim 1 is further amended to recite "annealing the gold in

forming gas at between about 500 and 600 °C for between about 12 and 60 hours to increase the biaxial texturing in the gold layer.” Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., in claim 6. When similar recitations were previously recited in claim 6, the Office Action relied on U.S. Patent No. 6,821,406 to Kobori, et al. (“Kobori”). However, Kobori states that “the treatment is conducted for 30 to 600 min” (or 0.5 to 10 hours) - and not 12 to 60 hours. Accordingly, Kobori does not achieve pure biaxial texturing. To the contrary, Kobori is directed to methods of gold-plating (see, e.g., Abstract) and therefore only achieves “no less than 60% planes with a (1, 1, 1) orientation.” Col. 3, lines 15-25.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Diaz and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 5 is canceled and therefore the rejection is moot. Claims 2 and 8-10 depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2 and 8-10 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 8-10 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 103(a) - Diaz

The Office Action rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diaz. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 15 is amended to recite “A method of depositing a gold layer having pure biaxial texturing onto a substrate comprising electrodepositing gold at a current density of

between about 0.10 and 3.5 mA/cm² for between about 1 and 60 minutes” (emphasis added). Diaz fails to disclose or suggest at least these recitations as discussed above for claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons claim 15 is believed to be allowable over Diaz and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a) - Diaz

The Office Action rejected claims 3-4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diaz. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 3-4 and 11 depend from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claims 3-4 and 11 are also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-4 and 11 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 103(a) – Diaz and Kobori

The Office Action rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diaz and further in view of Kobori. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 6 is canceled and therefore the rejection is moot. Claim 7 depends from claim 1, which is believed to be allowable. Therefore, claim 7 is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-7 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter.

Respectfully Submitted,



Mark D. Trenner, Reg. No. 43,961

Patent Attorney

National Renewable Energy Laboratory
1617 Cole Blvd
Golden, CO 80401
303/384-7365